

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 were examined, with claims 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-27, 31-37, 39-45, and 47 rejected. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 9, 18, 21, 28-30, 38, and 46.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for conducting the telephonic interview on September 12, 2005. The substance of the interview is reflected in the remarks below.

Turning to the substance of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-27, 31-37, 39-45, and 47 remain rejected as being unpatentable over Bouis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,608) in view of Merritt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,250). It is the Examiner's position that Bouis discloses all of the claimed features of the independent claims except for the wireless communication system having a plurality of processors executed in accordance with a communication protocol; in an attempt to make up for this deficiency, the Examiner applies Merritt.

Claims 1 and 31 are directed to a wireless communication system and method for hosting a plurality of processes, each process in the plurality of processes executed in accordance with a communication protocol, the communication protocol including a set of functions.

Bouis is directed to a completely different system from that of claims 1 and 31. That is, Bouis is directed to multimedia conversion, and more specifically to a transcoder system wherein a controller selects and arranges multimedia conversion modules in a series to provide conversion from a source multimedia format to a destination multimedia format. (Col. 2, lines 27-31.) Bouis' main focus is converting streaming video and audio over the internet that is wireless (as opposed to wireless). (Col. 1, line 66, through col. 2, line 9.)

Because Bouis is directed to a completely different system from the present invention, there are many claimed features not taught or suggested by Bouis. For example, Bouis does not suggest a plurality of processes executed in accordance with a wireless communication protocol, as required claims 1 and 31 and their dependent claims. A communication protocol is a set of rules governing

the format of communications between a mobile phone and a base station. Examples of wireless communication protocols include TDMA (time division multiple access) and CDMA (code division multiple access). Applicant is not asserting that independent claims 1 and 31 recite the TDMA and CDMA protocols, but is merely providing the Examiner with examples of wireless communication protocols. Bouis does not in any way relate to such wireless protocols. Again, Bouis discusses converting multimedia from one format to another over a wireline system.

Merritt is also directed to a completely different system from the present invention. Merritt is directed to a system for communicating images across a network (e.g., a public switched telecommunications network (PSTN), which is a wireline network) among users with disparate end systems running potentially dissimilar image protocols and formats. The system includes an image-profile database 24, which holds profiles of end users. The profiles typically include the capabilities of the end systems of the subscribing end users for storing, processing, and displaying images, preferably including the acceptable and preferred image protocols, compression methods, and image formats for each user. A communication of an originating image from a calling party to a called party is diverted to the network-based image processing system 10. The network-based image processing system 10 ascertains whether the originating image file format and protocol matches the called party preferred file format and protocol, which is stored in the database 24. If there is no match, the image file format conversion server converts the calling party image file to the acceptable or preferred image file format of the called party. This server preferably includes conversion control processor 26 and one or more conversion processors 271, 272 ...27n.

While Merritt may teach that the network may be a PSTN, and specifically an AT&T network, it does not suggest a wireless communication system or protocol. A PSTN is a wireline rather than a wireless network, and thus Merritt is a directly to a communication system very different than that claimed. Wireless and wireline systems have very different architectures, and features of one system are not applicable to the other. Merritt is therefore not applicable to claims 1 and 31, or their dependent claims.

Many of the claims dependent on independent claims 1 and 31 define further details of the invention relating to only wireless communication systems. A more detailed explanation follows:

Dependent claims 13-16, 42, and 43 recite CDMA and TDMA protocols, which are wireless communication protocols. Merritt does not suggest any CDMA or TDMA protocols, as alleged by the Examiner. While Merritt mentions an AT&T network, this network is wireline rather than a wireless network.

Dependent claims 7, 8, 19, 20, 36, 37, and 43 recite an “echo.” As explained in paragraph 52 of the published application, “The term echo is also used to refer to a multipath. Echoes are caused when the signal emitted from a transmitter ‘bounces’ off an object and arrives at the receiver through an alternate, delayed path.” Echoes and multipath are concepts associated with wireless, and not wireline, communication systems.

Dependent claim 17 recites that “said ASISP is a finger ASISP and said subset of functions comprises a delay lock loop (DLL) and a channel estimation.” A “finger” ASISP and “channel estimation” are also concepts associated with wireless, rather than wireline, communication systems.

Wireless and wireline systems have very different architectures, and features from one system are not applicable to the other. As discussed above, Bouis and Merritt do not suggest a wireless communication system, and thus could not involve the recited wireless concepts. Dependent claims 7, 8, 13-17, 19, 20, 36, 37, 42, and 43 are therefore patentable over the applied references for this additional reason.

Each of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 23, 24, and 31) recites a plurality of application specific instruction set processors (ASISPs), each ASISP capable of executing a subset of the set of functions included in the communication protocol. An ASISP is a specific type of device that is different from a dedicated hardware architecture and different from a software architecture (programmable CPU based). An ASISP takes the best features of both of these architectures and combines them into a single architecture.

As described in the background section in paragraphs 18-20 of the published version of this application, prior art wireless communication systems use general purpose digital signal processors (DSPs). DSPs take an unsatisfactory amount of time to switch from one process to another process, thereby requiring large numbers of DSPs to provide adequate computational support and leading to a large energy consumption profile.

Neither Bouis nor Merritt, alone or in combination, suggests a plurality of ASISPs. Nothing in Bouis suggests that the modules 420, 430, 440 are ASISPs, and nothing in Merritt suggests that its conversion processors 27 are ASISPs. These modules and conversion processors could just as well be the inefficient DSPs described in the background section of the application. Thus, the claims are patentable over the applied references for at least this reason.

Many of the dependent claims (e.g., claims 2-8, 10-12, 17, 18, 22, 25-27, 32-37, 39-41, and 47) recite further details of the ASISPs. Since the applied references do not suggest ASISPs, it necessarily follows that they also do not suggest the details of the ASISPs recited in these dependent claims. Thus dependent claims 2-8, 10-12, 17, 18, 22, 25-27, 32-37, 39-41, and 47 are further patentable over the applied references for this additional reason.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentable over the applied references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection is therefore respectfully requested. Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Laura C. Brutman
Laura C. Brutman
Registration No.: 38,395
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant